

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 8, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Cheng et al. (US 5,345,366).

The Examiner objected to claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. In response, Applicants have rewritten claims 2, 9, and 16 in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claims and therefore Applicants maintain that claims 2, 9, and 16 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 3-7 depend from claim 2, claims 10-14 depend from claim 9, and claims 17-20 depend from claim 16, Applicants contend that claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-20 are likewise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicants contend that the rejection of claims 8-14 is moot since claim 8 has been canceled.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 03/24/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

10/666,607

11